



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**United States Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/535,300	03/24/00	SCHWABACHER	A 2003118-0001

KAROLINE K SHAIR  
CHOATE HALL AND STEWART  
EXCHANGE PLACE  
53 STATE STREET  
BOSTON MA 02109-2891

HM22/0705

EXAMINER

GARCIA, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1627

DATE MAILED:

07/05/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/535,300

Applicant(s)  
Schwabacher et al

Examiner  
Maurie E. Garcia, Ph. D.

Art Unit  
1627



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ONE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claims 1-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

**Please Note:** In an effort to enhance communication with our customers and reduce processing time, Group 1627 is running a Fax Response Pilot for Written Restriction Requirements. A dedicated Fax machine is in place to receive your responses. The Fax number is 703-305-3704. A Fax cover sheet is attached to this Office Action for your convenience. We encourage your participation in this Pilot program. Thank you in advance for allowing us to enhance our customer service. Please limit the use of this dedicated Fax number to responses to Written Restrictions.

### *Election/Restriction*

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
  - I. Claims 1 (in part), 2, and 6-13, drawn to an array of agents where the agents are chemical compounds, classified in various classes depending on the compounds, for example, any of class 540-570, subclasses various.
  - II. Claims 1 (in part), 3, 4, and 6-13, drawn to an array of agents where the agents are peptides/proteins, classified in various classes depending on the peptides/proteins, for example, any of class 530, subclasses 300+.
  - III. Claims 1 (in part), and 5-13, drawn to an array of agents where the agents are polynucleotides, classified in various classes depending on the polynucleotides, for example, any of class 536, subclasses 23.1+.
  - IV. Claims 14-16, drawn to a method of preparing an array, classified in various classes, for example, any of class 435, subclasses 7.1, 7.2, class 436, subclasses 510, 518, etc.
  - V. Claims 17-28, drawn to a method of analyzing an array, classified in various classes, for example, any of class 435, subclasses 7.1, 7.2, class 436, subclasses 510, 518, etc.

VI. Claim 29, drawn to a second method of analyzing an array, classified in various classes, for example, any of class 435, subclasses 7.1, 7.2, class 436, subclasses 510, 518, etc.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:
3. Groups I-III represent separate and distinct products. They differ in respect to their properties, their use and the synthetic methodology for making them. Therefore, they have different issues regarding patentability and enablement and represent patentably distinct subject matter. In the instant case, the each of the arrays contains compounds of completely different chemical structure.
4. Groups I-III and V & VI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, the arrays of Groups I-III could be used as starting materials for the synthesis of further arrays.
5. Groups IV and I-III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP

§ 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the arrays of Groups I-III could be made by a different process; for example, the arrays could be made by dipping the fiber to make a thin film.

6. Groups IV-VI are different methods. The methods are different because they use different steps, require different reagents and will produce different products and/or results. They therefore have different issues regarding patentability and enablement and represent patentably distinct subject matter. In the instant case, the method of making (Group IV) is completely different from the methods of analyzing (Groups V and VI), requiring different reagents (e.g. agents, reactive moieties) and having completely different end results. The methods of analyzing (Groups V and VI) are different from each other because they each require different steps and require different materials. Group VI requires a second fiber and has steps using this second fiber for excitation/detection; these steps are not required for Group V.

7. These inventions have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and/or divergent subject matter. Please note that even though some of these groups could be classified in the same class/subclass, this has no effect on the non-patent literature search. Different methods and products would require completely different searches in these databases, and there is no expectation that the searches would be coextensive. Therefore, this does create an undue search burden, and restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. This application contains claims directed to patentably distinct species of the claimed invention for **Groups I-III and V**. Election is required as follows.

9. If applicant elects the invention of **any of Groups I-III**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. An election from each of the following is required.

Species of cladding

Species 1: Sol-gel	Claim 8
Species 2: Polymer	Claim 9

Species of derivative

Species 1: Aminopropylsilyl	Claim 11
Species 2: Silyl	Claim 12

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

10. If applicant elects the invention of **Group V**, applicant is required to elect from the following patentably distinct species. An election from each of the following is required.

Species of light source

Species 1: Laser	Claim 20
Species 2: Pulsed laser diode	Claim 21
Species 3: LED	Claim 22

Species of detector

Species 1: PMT	Claim 23
Species 2: CCD	Claim 24
Species 3: Photodiode array	Claim 25

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting

materials from which they are made. Therefore, the species have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

The species are distinct, each from the other, because their structures and modes of action are different. They would also differ in their reactivity and the starting materials from which they are made. Therefore, the groups have different issues regarding patentability and represent patentably distinct subject matter.

11. Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.
12. Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, ***and a listing of all claims readable thereon***, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.
13. Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).
14. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

15. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). Because the above restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicants to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.


16. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

17. Applicant is also reminded that a 1 - month (not less than 30 days) shortened statutory period will be set for response when a written requirement is made without an action on the merits. This period may be extended under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Such action will not be an "action on the merits" for purposes of the second action final program, see MPEP 809.02(a).



18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maurie E. Garcia, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0065. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 to 6:00 and alternate Fridays.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jyothsna Venkat, can be reached on (703) 308-2439. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

  
DR. JYOTHSNA VENKAT PH.D.  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Maurie E. Garcia, Ph.D.  
July 2, 2001